DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 249 248 TM 840 589

AUTHOR Beck, Donald
TITLE Home School and Adult Instruction Component, Home-School-Community Agents Project. Final Evaluation Report.
INSTITUTION Columbus Public Schools, OH. Dept. of Evaluation Services.
PUB DATE Jul 83
NOTE 43p.
PUB TYPE Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160) -- Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adjustment Counselors; *Ancillary School Services; Attitude Measures; *Behavior Problems; Disadvantaged Youth; Family School Relationship; Inservice Teacher Education; Intermediate Grades; Problem Children; *Program Evaluation; *School Counseling; Secondary Education; State Programs; *Student Attitudes; Student Characteristics; Teacher Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS *Columbus Public Schools OH; *Disruptive Behavior; Ohio Disadvantaged Pupil Program Fund

ABSTRACT

The goal of the Home-School-Community Agents (HSCA) Program is to help disruptive pupils make a positive adjustment to those elements in their lives which interfere with their success in school. In 1982-83, 20 HSCA served 8 high schools and 12 middle schools in Columbus, Ohio. Each agent worked in depth with approximately 60 descriptive pupils and served as a home-school-community liaison. This report evaluates the 1982-83 program in regard to four stated program objectives for the year. Data were collected in seven information areas: (1) pupil attitude (using the Demos D Scale); (2) pupil entry; (3) pupil census; (4) pupil questionnaire; (5) professional staff survey; (6) HSCA activity logs; and (7) inservice evaluation. The evaluation sample consisted of 400 pupils, grades 6 through 12, randomly selected from the 1,200 in the project. Findings indicate the project was successful in identifying disruptive students and helping them make some positive adjustments. Pupils and professional staff involved in the project considered it valuable. However, pupils did not show a statistically significant improvement in student attitude. The appendix contains posttest dropout probability category tables for each grade, and six of the evaluation instruments. (BS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED249248

Ohio Disadvantaged Pupil Program Fund

FINAL EVALUATION REPORT
HOME SCHOOL AND ADULT INSTRUCTION COMPONENT
HOME-SCHOOL-COMMUNITY AGENTS PROJECT

July, 1983

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
G. Thompson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Written by:

Donald Beck, Professional Specialist

Under the Supervision of

John Duffy

and

Richard A. Amorose, Ph.D.

TM 840 589

Columbus (Ohio) Public Schools
Department of Evaluation Services
Gary Thompson, Ph.D., Director

Ohio Disadvantaged Pupil Program Fund

FINAL EVALUATION REPORT
HOME SCHOOL AND ADULT INSTRUCTION COMPONENT
HOME-SCHOOL-COMMUNITY AGENTS PROJECT

July, 1983

Program Description

The Home-School-Community Agents project has been operating in the Columbus Public Schools since the 1968-69 school year. The overall goal is to help disruptive pupils make a positive adjustment to those elements in their lives that interfere with their success in school. As defined by the HSCA project, "disruptive" refers to any action or behavior which interrupts the educational process of the pupil in or out of the school.

To reach the 1982-83 project goal, 20 Home-School-Community Agents (HSCA) served 8 high schools and 12 middle schools. The schools are listed below:

High Schools	Middle Schools	
Briggs	Barrett	Indianola
Brookhaven	Beery	Linmoor
East	Crestview	Medina
Linden McKinley	Eastmoor	Mohawk
Marion Franklin	Everett	Starling
South	Hilltonia	Westmoor
West		
Whetstone		

Each HSCA worked on an in-depth basis with approximately 60 pupils who had been identified as disruptive. Each HSCA was asked to designate 20 of these pupils for inclusion in the evaluation sample. In addition to direct contact with project pupils, the HSCA served as a home-school-community liaison to promote understanding and to assist pupils in their adjustment to the school environment.

Evaluation Objectives

Objective 1.0 The group of selected pupils who are served by the HSCA for the entire treatment period will show statistically significant improvement in their attitude toward the school environment.

Objective 2.0 At the culmination of the agent-pupil sessions, at least 50% of the selected pupils will demonstrate a positive adjustment to those elements of the pupils' lives which interfere with their success in school.

Criterion 2.1 Identification of "disruptive" elements and/or pupil concern which appear to be obstructing pupil achievement.

Criterion 2.2 Evidence of positive adjustment of at least 50% of selected pupils.

Objective 3.0 To serve as a home-school-community liaison to promote understanding and assistance for the adjustment of pupils to the school environment.

Criterion 3.1 Evidence of working with home, school, and/or community agencies to promote understanding and assistance for the adjustment of pupils to the school environment.

Objective 4.0 To provide at least two inservice sessions to program personnel such that at least 80% of the inservice participants will rate each session as valuable in providing information that will assist them in carrying out their program responsibilities.

Evaluation Design

The evaluation design for the HSCA Project called for the collection of data in seven areas. Except for Demos D Scale the Appendix contains a copy of each instrument used in the evaluation.

1. Pupil Attitude Information

The Demos D Scale (DDS; Demos, 1970) provide a measure of pupil attitudes and the probability of dropping out of school. The pretest was given during the week of October 25, 1982 and the posttest was given during the week of May 6, 1983.

The DDS is composed of 29 items that yield four Basic Area Scores and a Total Score. Pupils are asked to rate each item on a 5-point scale that, except for one item, ranges from "nearly always" to "nearly never". Higher scores indicate a poorer attitude and a higher probability of dropping out of school. The four Basic Area Scores and Total Score are as follows:

T (Teachers): Deals with attitudes toward teachers, counselors, and administrators. This area is comprised of 10 items with scores ranging from 10-50.

E (Education): Deals with attitudes toward education, training, and college. This area is comprised of nine items with scores ranging from 9-45.

P (Peers): Deals with attitudes toward peers and parents. This area is comprised of five items with scores ranging from 5-25.

S (School): Deals with attitudes toward school behavior. This area is comprised of five items with scores ranging from 5-25.

Total Score: The text publisher indicates that, based on the results of clinical experience, this is the best predictor of dropping out of school. Scores range from 29-145.

The test publisher cites the six uses for the DDS. First, it provides an objective method for obtaining expressions of attitudes related to dropping out of school. The DDS is of special help in working with junior and senior high school students. Second, it identifies students with strongly negative attitudes toward teachers and school, so preventive or corrective work can take place while students still are in school. Third, the instrument can make it possible to alert parents of children who indicate that they may drop out of school. Fourth, data can be provided about students to facilitate the counseling or psychotherapy of problem children. Fifth, data can be used to structure or develop school programs for identifying and working with potential dropouts so schools can be of help in reducing dropouts. Sixth, the instrument can provide a research approach in areas such as dropping out of school, adjusting to school, attitude formation, effective learning, etc.

2. Pupil Entry Information

The Pupil Entry Information Sheet provided individual pupil data on those elements obstructing pupil achievement which formed the basis for assigning pupils to the project. It also identified the person referring the pupil to the project. It was completed by the HSCA's, and collected in October, 1982.

3. Pupil Census Information

HSCA's completed a Pupil Census Form for each pupil in the evaluation sample. These forms were collected in the middle of May, 1983. Pupil Census Forms provided individual data on seven items: pupil involvement with the court, number of months in the project, number of contacts with the pupil, number of in-school conferences with the pupil, number of home visits made regarding the pupil, pupil referral to a community agency, and an assessment of the pupils' adjustment to school.

4. Pupil Questionnaire Information

The Pupil Questionnaire was used to survey pupils in the evaluation sample to determine their perceptions of the HSCA's role in providing adjustment to the home-school-community environment, and for evidence of pupils' adjustment to school. The instrument was administered in February, 1983.

5. Professional Staff Survey Information

The Professional Staff Questionnaire was designed to determine perceptions of school professional staff regarding the HSCA role as a liaison between the school and the home and community. It was administered in the latter half of February, 1983, to those members of school professional staffs who had referred pupils for inclusion in the HSCA Project, as determined from the Pupil Entry Information Sheet.

6. HSCA Log Information

The purpose of the HSCA Log Sheet was to provide documentation of a Home-School-Community Agent's activities in a single day. The instrument was completed twice by each HSCA, once during November, 1982, and once during April, 1983. Specific days to be logged were assigned randomly.

7. Inservice Evaluation Information

The General Inservice Evaluation Form was used to document the number of inservice meetings held and obtain the ratings of HSCA's regarding the value of inservice that was provided. Ratings were obtained in the following areas; how worthwhile the meeting was, usefulness of the information presented, time available to ask questions, and how adequately questions were answered. The rating scale used was (1) Strongly Disagree, (2) Disagree, (3) Undecided, (4) Agree, (5) Strongly Agree.

Major Findings

The evaluation sample consisted of 400 pupils who were randomly selected from the 1,200 pupils served by the project. The grade and sex of sample pupils is presented in Table 1. The sample was comprised of 132 girls and 268 boys.

Table 1

Grade and Sex of Pupils
in the Evaluation Sample

Grade	Pupils Served	Girls	Boys
6	50	17	33
7	75	23	52
8	115	32	83
9	66	22	44
10	46	17	29
11	27	9	18
12	21	12	9
Total	400	132	268

Objective 1.0 required that the group of selected pupils who were served by the HSCA for the entire treatment period would show statistically significant improvement in their attitude toward the school environment. The pupils were pretested during the week of October 25, 1982 and posttested during the week of May 6, 1983 with the Demos D Scale (DDS). The DDS yields four Basic Area Scores and a Total Score which provide data to be compared with the standardization group. Scores can be interpreted in terms of probability of dropping out of school. The higher the score the greater the probability of dropping out of school. If it can be assumed that pupils with a high probability

of dropping out of school have a poor attitude about teachers, and school behavior, a lower posttest score on the Demos D Sale should be one indication of a "positive" change in attitude.

Pretest-posttest DDS scores were collected for 232 (58.0%) of the 400 pupils in the evaluation sample. To determine if sample pupils did show statistically significant improvement in attitude, a *t*-test for correlated data of the DDS Total Score was calculated. Table 2 contains the results of this analysis. The *t*-value was not statistically significant ($p < .05$). Thus, Objective 1.0 was not achieved. The average posttest DDS Total Score was slightly higher (more negative) than the pretest average. An examination of these data indicated no marked changes in pupil attitude.

Table 3 contains descriptive data regarding the pretest-posttest DDS Basic Area Scores and Total Score reported by grade level. Slight improvement in attitudes toward teachers was found in grades 8 and 10. Improvement in attitude toward education was found in grades 8 and 11. Improvement in attitudes toward school behavior are found in grades 8 and 10.

Table 2

Means, Standard Deviation and Associated
t-Value of the Pretest-Posttest
DDS Total Score

	Pretest		Posttest		
Number of Pupils	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation	t-Value
232	63.4	12.8	64.7	13.4	1.44

According to the dropout probabilities provided by the test publisher, the pupils in the evaluation sample had, on average, a 50% chance of dropping out before and after their involvement in the project. The probabilities are expressed as the chance of dropping out per 100 pupils. The data in Figure 1 show that of the 232 pupils in the evaluation sample, 11 pupils (4.7%) had a lower probability of dropping out, and 28 pupils (12.1%) had a higher probability of dropping out at the end of the treatment period. This same information is reported by grade level in the Appendix.

The Pupil Entry Information Sheet provided data on who referred pupils and why they were referred to the HSCA. Table 4 contains a ranking of the frequency and percent by school level of the reasons that pupils were referred. The frequencies and percents in this table are not additive, since a pupil could be referred for more than one reason.

Poor Grades ranked among the top referral reasons at both middle school and high school levels. Pupil-Teacher Conflict rated much higher at middle school (45.4%) than at high school level (25.0%). Class cutting as referral reason was more prominent at the high school level (59.4%) than at the middle school (6.3%) level. Hostility to Authority rated fourth in occurrence at the middle school level and seventh in the high school level.

Table 3

Pretest, Posttest and Change Means for DDS Basic Area Scores and Total Score Reported By Grade Level

Grade Level	Number of Pupils		T Attitudes Towards Teachers	E Attitudes Toward Education	P Influence by Peers and Parents	S Attitudes Toward School Behavior	Total Score
6	34	Pretest Mean	25.0	15.8	11.3	10.7	62.7
		Posttest Mean	26.4	17.0	11.6	11.7	66.7
		Change in Mean	1.4	1.2	0.3	1.0	4.0
7	35	Pretest Mean	26.0	16.5	11.1	11.2	64.8
		Posttest Mean	27.8	18.9	11.5	11.2	69.3
		Change in Mean	1.8	2.4	0.4	0.0	4.5
8	70	Pretest Mean	24.8	16.0	11.2	10.5	62.6
		Posttest Mean	24.0	15.5	10.5	10.3	60.4
		Change in Mean	-0.8	-0.5	-0.7	-0.2	-2.2
9	333	Pretest Mean	26.3	15.6	10.6	10.9	63.4
		Posttest Mean	27.4	18.6	11.8	11.8	69.6
		Change in Mean	1.1	3.0	1.2	0.9	6.2
10	25	Pretest Mean	26.6	16.8	10.6	10.8	64.8
		Posttest Mean	25.4	16.9	10.5	11.4	64.2
		Change in Mean	-1.2	0.1	-0.1	-0.6	-0.6
11	16	Pretest Mean	25.3	17.7	11.2	11.4	65.5
		Posttest Mean	26.5	16.4	9.9	11.4	64.1
		Change in Mean	1.2	-1.3	-1.3	0.0	-1.4
12	19	Pretest Mean	24.1	15.9	10.4	10.8	61.2
		Posttest Mean	24.8	15.9	9.9	10.9	61.5
		Change in Mean	0.7	0.0	-0.5	0.1	0.3
Total	232	Pretest Mean	25.4	16.2	11.0	10.8	63.4
		Posttest Mean	25.8	16.9	10.9	11.1	64.7
		Change in Mean	0.4	0.7	-0.1	0.3	1.3

Note. A negative change indicates improvement.

Table 4

Frequency of Reasons for Referral to HSCA Program

Referral Reason	Total Component (Grades 6-12) Rank	Frequency	%	Middle School (Grades 6-8) Rank	Frequency	%	High School (Grades 9-12) Rank	Frequency	%
Poor Grades	1	173	43.3	1	115	47.9	2	58	36.3
Pupil-Teacher Conflict	2	149	37.3	2	109	45.4	5	40	25.0
Class Cutting	3	110	27.5	8	15	6.3	1	95	59.4
Attendance Problem	4	10[illegible]	15.3	5	48	20.0	3	53	33.1
Peer Conflict	5	86	21.5	3	64	26.7	8	22	13.8
Hostile to Authority	6	79	19.8	4	51	21.3	7	28	17.5
Family Problem	7	67	16.8	7	26	10.8	4	41	25.6
Truancy	8	55	13.8	6	38	15.8	9	17	10.6
Law-court Conflict	9	37	9.3	10	8	3.3	6	29	18.1
Health Problem	10	17	4.3	9	9	3.8	10	8	5.0
Other		79	19.8		58	24.2		15	9.4

As has been indicated, a pupil may be referred to the HSCA program for one or more of the reasons indicated in Table 4. In Table 5, the number of reasons for which individual students were referred is summarized. Less than one-third of the students (29.5%) were referred for a single reason, and another one-third were referred for two reasons. The remainder of students were referred for three or more reasons.

Table 5

Number of Reasons for which Students were Referred to the HSCA Program

Number of Reasons for Referral	Frequency	Percent
1	118	29.5
2	138	34.5
3	72	18.0
4	41	10.3
5	19	4.7
6	8	2.0
7	2	0.5
8	2	0.5
Total	400	100.0

The Pupil Census Forms provided individual data on pupil involvement with the court. Analysis of the Pupil Census Forms indicated that 119 (29.8%) of the 400 pupils in the sample had been involved with the court.

Table 6 presents the number of months pupils were served by the project. These data include any service received previous to the present school year. A majority of pupils in the evaluation sample (258) had been served by the project for 6 to 10 months. An additional 71 were served for 11 months or more. Thus, a considerable proportion of the pupils have been served by the project for one or more years.

Table 6

Number of Months Pupils Were Served by the HSCA Project as of May 16, 1983

Number of Months	Number of Pupils	Percent of Pupils
0-5	71	17.7
6-10	258	64.5
11-15	30	7.5
16-20	36	9.0
21-25	3	0.8
26-30	2	0.5
Total	400	100.0

HSCA's were asked to indicate the number of contacts made with each pupil. Analysis of this data indicates that 77.5% of the pupils in the evaluation sample were seen seven or more times. Over half (201) were seen 11 or more times. A large portion of the HSCA's time is spent in conferences as a result. HSCA's indicated that seven or more in-school conferences were held regarding 57.8% of the pupils in the evaluation sample. In addition, four or more home visits were made involving 36.5% of the pupils. The data relating to pupil contacts is contained in Table 7.

Table 7

Frequency of HSCA Contacts, In-school Conferences, and Home Visits with Each Pupil

	Number of Contacts			
	0-3	4-6	7-19	11 or more
Contacts with the pupil	34	56	109	201
In school conferences held regarding this pupil	79	90	87	144
Home visits made regarding this pupil	254	77	34	35

HSCA's also rated each pupil's final outcome in relation to the original reasons for the pupil's referral. The following change categories were used: Marked Improvement, Improvement, or No Improvement. The final outcome ratings of the 400 pupils in the evaluation sample are summarized in Table 8.

Table 8

Number of Percentage of
Pupils by Improvement Category

Change	Number of Pupils	Percent of Pupils
Marked Improvement	84	21.0
Improvement	219	54.8
No Improvement	97	24.2
Total	400	100.0

Table 8 shows that 303 (75.8%) of the pupils in the sample were rated as having derived some benefit ("Improvement" or "Marked Improvement") from the project. Thus, Objective 2.0 was achieved. Of these, 84 were rated in the highest change category, "Marked Improvement". These are encouraging results for pupils who are in the project because of disruptive influences.

The pupils were surveyed during the week of February 21, 1983 with the locally constructed Pupil Questionnaire. The Pupil Questionnaire was designed to determine student perceptions of the HSCA role in promoting adjustment in the home-school-community environment and to provide data regarding the student's adjustment to school.

Of the 338 Pupil Questionnaires that were distributed, 272 (80.5%) were returned. In the following analysis, all percents are based on the number of pupils returning the survey. The most frequent source of original referral to the program as perceived by students were principal or vice principal and teachers (37.5%). The fact that 27.6% of the students indicated that they had come to the HSCA on their own seems to speak well of the program's credibility with students. An additional 11.4% of the pupils indicated that they entered into the program at the request of their parents; this also speaks well of the program. More than one reason for entry could be given by the same student. The results of the survey are summarized in Tables 9-13.

When asked which activities HSCA's had performed in order to help them, students indicated the following: "Took time to discuss my problems with me" (80.5%); "Visited my home" (50.4%); "Arranged meeting with teacher(s)," (57.4%); "Visited community agency on my behalf such as CMACAO, health center, or counseling agency " (19.1%).

Table 9

Entry Into The Program

Reason Pupil Met with HSCA	Percent Responding Yes	No	Don't Know
The principal or vice principal arranged it	37.5%	23.5%	17.6%
My teacher(s) arranged it	30.9%	25.7%	12.1%
I had a problem and went to see the Home-School-Community Agent on my own	27.6%	33.5%	6.6%
My parents) arranged it	11.4%	36.0%	11.8%
My friend(s) arranged it	11.4%	40.1%	9.6%

Table 10

Activities to Help the Pupil

Activities	Percent Responding Yes	No	Don't Know
Took time to discuss my problems with me	80.5%	6.6%	2.2%
Arranged meeting(s) with teacher(s)	57.4%	14.0%	7.7%
Visited my home	50.4%	26.8%	3.7%
Visited a community agent on my behalf such as CMACAO, Health Center, or counseling agency	19.1%	32.7%	21.7%

Table 11

Attitudes Toward School And Teachers

Question	Percent Responding Yes	No	Don't Know
Since I talked to the Home-School-Community Agent, I am getting along better with my teacher.	72.1%	11.8%	9.2%
I feel my classroom attendance has improved since meeting with the Home-School-Community Agent.	68.0%	13.2%	14.7%
I am keeping up with my assignments better since working with the Home-School-Community Agent.	66.2%	16.2%	14.7%

Table 12

Perceptions Of The Helpfulness Of The HSCA

Question	Percent Responding Yes	No	Don't Know
The Home-School-Community Agent was helpful to me.	82.0%	5.9%	7.4%
When a pupil has trouble with school or with a teacher, it is a good idea to talk it over with the Home-School-Community Agent.	89.7%	2.9%	7.4%
Pupils with problems can get help from the Home-School-Community-Agent.	89.3%	1.1%	9.2%

Table 13

Pupil's Adjustment To Family And Friends

Question	Percent Responding Yes	No	Don't Know
Since I talked to the Home-School-Community Agent, I am getting along better with my family	61.4%	8.8%	8.1%
Since I talked to the Home-School-Community Agent, I am getting along better with my friends.	54.8%	11.8%	12.5%

Students were asked about their adjustment since talking with the HSCA. Of the students responding, 72.1% said that they were getting along better with their teachers, 61.4% said that they were getting along better with their families,and 54.8% said that they were getting along better with their friends

It seems that a large proportion of the HSCA's efforts are directed toward student conferences. When asked if it was a good idea to talk over their school-related problems with the HSCA, 84.7% of students responded "yes". Over 89% agreed that students with problems can get help from the HSCA. When asked if the HSCA was helpful, 82.0% answered "yes". More than two-thirds of responding students agreed that their classroom behavior had improved (68.0%) and that they were doing better in keeping up with their assignments (66.2%) since meeeting with the HSCA.

The professional staff members were surveyed during the period of February 14th through 25th, 1983 with the locally constructed Professional Staff Survey. The Professional Staff Survey was designed to determine perceptions of school professional staff regarding the HSCA's role as a liaison between the school and the home and the community. The surveys were sent to those members of the school professional staffs who had referred students for inclusion in the HSCA program. A total of 150 Professional Staff Surveys were distributed. Of this number 112 (74.7%) were returned.

Table 14 contains the percent of staff ratings on items regarding the value of HSCA services. To simplify the analysis the strongly agree and agree categories were combined. Analysis of the data indicated that 87.4% of the respondents viewed the HSCA as effective in the role of a liaison between the school, the home, and the community. The services of the HSCA to the total instructional effort of the school was considered valuable by 91.9% of the respondents.

A total of 82.1% of respondents reported improvement among the students they had referred to the HSCA for assistance. Members of the professional staff generally agreed that the services of the HSCA helped the students adjust to school, home, and community. Positive ratings were given by 83.0% of the respondents for adjustment to school, by 58.9% for adjustment to home, and 58.0% for adjustment to the community.

Table 14

Effectiveness of the HSCA Project
As Pereceived by the Professional Staff

Item	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Response
The Home-School-Community Agents role as a liaison between home, school, community is important.	79.5%	17.8%	2.7%	0%	0%	0%
The Home-School-Community Agent has been effective in providing liaison between home, school, and community.	67.9%	21.4%	9.8%	0.9%	0%	0%
The services of the Home-School-Community Agent to the total instructional effort at your building are valuable.	61.5%	30.4%	5.4%	2.7%	0%	0%
The student(s) you referred to the Home-School Community Agent showed some improvement.	36.6%	45.5%	13.4%	3.6%	0.9%	0%
The Home-School-Community Agent helps the disruptive student(s) make positive adjustment to school.	37.5%	45.5%	13.4%	2.7%	0.9%	0%
The Home-School-Community Agent helps the disruptive student(s) make positive adjustment to home.	17.9%	41.0%	35.7%	0.9%	4.5%	0%
The Home-School-Community Agent helps the disruptive student(s) make positive adjustment to the community.	18.8%	39.2%	37.5%	0.9%	3.6%	0%

Respondents also indicated the extent the HSCA used various activities to help the students they had referred to the program (see Table 15). The percent of respondents giving the highest frequency ratings (i.e., Frequently, Sometimes) was 91.1% for student conferences, 83.9% for home visits, 75.1% for students conferences in which parents or professional staff were also included, and 67.0% for enlisting help from community agencies. In addition, 37.5% indicated that the HSCA had frequently helped the students find employment, and 62.5% indicated that the HSCA had frequently appeared in court in regard to the student. The high percentage of respondents that felt the HSCA used student conferences as a means of solving a student's problem is consistent with the data collected on the Pupil Survey and HSCA Log Sheets.

Table 15

Actions Taken by the HSCA
As Perceived by the Professional Staff

Item	Percent Responding					No
	Frequently	Sometimes	Undecided	Infrequently	Never	Response
Made home visits	58.9%	25.0%	3.6%	3.6%	0.9%	8.0%
Held conference(s) with you concerning the student(s)	63.4%	25.9%	0.9%	5.4%	2.7%	1.7%
Had conferences with student(s) you referred	73.2%	17.9%	2.7%	2.7%	0%	3.5%
Arranged student conferences at school which included parents and/or professional staff	43.8%	31.3%	7.1%	7.1%	5.4%	5.3%
Enlisted help from community agencies (such as CMACAO, CETA, Health Centers, Etc.)	36.6%	30.4%	19.6%	3.6%	3.6%	6.2%
Helped student(s) find employment	15.2%	22.3%	29.5%	5.4%	13.4%	14.2%
Appeared in court in regard to the student(s)	27.7%	34.8%	19.6%	0.9%	8.0%	9.0%

The HSCA Log Sheet is an evaluation instrument which provides documentation of the activities of a HSCA in a single day. The instrument was completed twice by each of the 20 HSCA's; once during the period of November 15-19, 1982, and once during the period of April 11-15, 1983. These months were selected in order to get estimates of the "typical" expenditure of a HSCA's time. HSCA's were randomly assigned days to log activities during both time periods. Combined data from the two administrations of the HSCA log are presented in Tables 16 and 17. Table 16 presents the total time in hours and minutes logged by the 20 HSCA's during the two days that were logged. Table 17 contains the average time in hours and minutes that would typify a HSCA's average daily involvement within these categories.

Table 16

Activities Logged by the HSCA's on the November and April Log Sheets, By Time and Percent Involved

Activities	Total Time (Hours and Minutes)	% of Time
Conferences at School		
With Students	70:42	22.9
With School Personnel	21:07	6.8
With Parent	11.26	3.7
With Community Agency	4:08	1.3
With Other	3:25	1.1
Total Conferences at School	110:48	35.8
Voluntary School Duties	30:31	9.9
Home Visits	35:05	11.3
Transport Student (Other Than Home)	7:40	2.5
Telephone Contact	21:30	7.0
Records, Reports, Paperwork, General Office Work	20:32	6.6
Supervising Special Projects	17:15	5.6
Check on Absent Students or Problem Students	13:44	4.4
Assigned School Duties	20:36	6.6
Utilizing Community Agencies or Resources	3:52	1.3
Court Appearance	5:45	1.9
Dealing with Disturbances	14:19	4.6
Attend Workshop or Staff Meeting	1:45	0.6
Other	5:50	1.9
Total Time Logged by 20 HSCA's	309:12	100.0%

Table 17

A Typical HSCA Work Day as Summarized
from the November and April HSCA Log Sheets

Activity	Time per Activity (Hours and Minutes)
Conferences at School	
With Student	1:46
With School Personnel	0:32
With Parent	0:17
With Community Agency	0:06
With Other than Above	0:05
Average Conferences at School	2:46
Voluntary School Duties	0:46
Home Visits	0:52
Transport Students (Other than Home)	0:11
Telephone Contact	0:32
Records, Reports, Paperwork, General Office Work	0:31
Supervising Special Projects	0:26
Check on Absent Students or Problem Students	0:21
Assigned School Duties	0:31
Utilizing Community Agencies or Resources	0:06
Court Appearance	0:09
Dealing with Disturbances	0:21
Attend Workshop or Staff Meeting	0:02
Other	0:09
Average Time, All Activities	7:43

Objective 3.0 required evidence that the HSCA's worked with home, school, and community agencies. The data in Table 18 indicate that considerable proportions of the HSCA's time was involved in direct service to students (29.8%), activities involving the school (33.6%), and activities involving the home (15.0%) with a smaller portion of the time involved with community agencies and resources (4.4%). The data indicate that Objective 3.0 was achieved.

Table 18

Summary of HSCA Activities by Percent of Time, and by Average Time Involved in a Typical HSCA Work Day

Type of Activity	Total Time Logged (Hours and Minutes)	Percent of Time	Average Time per Day (Hours and Minutes)
Direct Service to Students	92:06	29.8	2:18
Activities Involving the Home	46:31	15.0	1:09
Activities Involving the School	103:48	33.6	2:36
Activities Involving Community Agencies	13:45	4.4	0:20
Miscellaneous Activities	53:02	17.2	1:20
Total, All Activities	309:12	100.0	7:43

Objective 4.0 was to provide at least two inservice sessions to program personnel such that at least 80% of the inservice participants would rate each session as valuable in providing information that will assist them in carrying out their program responsibilities. There were four inservice meetings for HSCA's in the school year. The topics and dates of these meetings were as follows: Orientation, September 9, 1982; Buckeye Boys Ranch, October 21, 1982; Project GOALS and Alcohol Use and Drug Abuse, November 18, 1983; and Alcohol Use and Drug Abuse, January 27, 1983. The meetings were rated by the HSCA's using the General Inservice Evaluation Form. Two of the inservice meetings were judged by all of the participants to have provided information that would assist them in their program. The other two meetings were judged by 93.9% of the participants to have provided information that would assist them in their program. The combined responses from the four evaluated meetings are summarized in Table 19. The rating scale key is: SD = Strongly Disagree, D = Disagree, U = Undecided, A = Agree, and SA = Strongly Agree. Thus Objective 4.0 was achieved.

Table 19

Average Responses and Response Frequencies
for Reactions to Inservice Statements

Statements	Number Responding	Average Response	Responses SD (1)	D (2)	U (3)	A (4)	SA (5)
I think this was a very worthwhile meeting.	60	4.6	2	0	0	14	44
The information presented in the meeting will assist me in my program.	60	4.5	2	0	0	12	46
There was time to ask questions pertaining to the presentation.	60	4.7	2	1	1	15	41
Questions were answered adequately.	60	4.7	2	0	1	16	41

Summary/Recommendations

The project had four objectives. The first objective stated that the group of selected pupils who are served by the HSCA for the entire treatment period will show statistically significant improvement in their attitudes toward the school environment. The second objective, states that at least 50% of the pupils in the evaluation sample demonstrate a positive adjustment to those elements that interfered with their success in school. This objective required identification of those elements which appeared to be obstructing pupil achievement, and evidence of positive adjustment by at least 50% of the pupils in the evaluation sample. The third objective was to serve as a home-school-community liaison to promote understanding and provide assistance for pupil adjustment to the school environment. This objective required evidence of working with home, school, and/or community agencies. The fourth objective was to provide two inservice sessions to project personnel.

Objective 1.0 was not achieved. Pupils did not show statistically significant ($p < .05$) improvement in their attitude as measured by the Total Score of the Demos D Scale (DDS). An examination of the pretest-posttest DDS data indicated that there were no marked changes in pupil attitude at any grade level for any of the four DDS Basic Area Scores or Total Score. Other evaluation data, which are summarized below, suggest that the DDS may well have provided an accurate picture of the serious nature of the attitudinal problems of project pupils;

and while the pupils, professional staff,and HSCA's perceived that pupils had improved, their improvement was not sufficient to change their attitudes as measured by the DDS.

The primary purpose of the DDS is to determine the probabilities of a pupil dropping out of school. The assumption is made that students who are likely to drop out of school have a poor attitude about teachers and school. The test publisher states that the DDS may be used to identify students with strongly negative attitudes toward teachers and school, but cautions that DDS scores be used with all other available information concerning the student. It is not advisable that DDS scores by themselves be used for definitive diagnostic purposes. Project pretest mean scores for the DDS Basic Area Score on Attitudes Toward Teachers indicated that in this area a majority of pupils in the sample had a strong or very strong probability of dropping out of school. This was also reflected in the fact that pupil-teacher conflict was the referral reason second most often cited for pupils needing the services of the HSCA.

The first criterion of Objective 2.0, identification of those elements which appeared to be obstructing pupil achievement, was evaluated on the basis of the Pupil Entry Information Sheet. The instrument provided individual pupil data which could be used by the HSCA, as well as for project evaluation. The four most frequent reasons for referral to the project were poor grades, pupil teacher conflict, class cutting, and attendance problems. More than two thirds (70.5%) of the pupils in the sample were referred for two or more reasons.

The second criterion of Objective 2.0, evidence of pupil adjustment by at least 50% of the pupils sampled, was primarily evaluated on the basis of individual data from the Pupil Census Forms. As rated by the HSCA's, 75.8% of pupils in the evaluation sample showed evidence of change in a positive direction, (54.8%) showed "improvement" and 21.0% showed "marked improvement". Further verification of the attainment of this criterion was provided by the Pupil Questionnaire and the Professional Staff Questionnaire. The majority of pupils responding to the Pupil Questionnaire reported that they were getting along better with their teachers (72.1%), families (61.4%), and friends (54.8%) since talking with the HSCA. Of those who responded to the Professional Staff Questionnaire, 82.1% reported improvement among the pupils they had referred to the HSCA for assistance. The data indicated that both criteria for Objective 2.0 were met, thus Objective 2.0 was achieved.

Objective 3.0 required evidence of working with home, school, and/or community agencies to promote understanding and provide assistance for the adjustment of pupils to the school environment. Data from two administrations of the HSCA Log indicated a considerable proportion of the HSCA's time was used for direct service to pupils (29.8%), activities involving the school (33.6%), and activities involving the home (15.0%), with a smaller proportion of the HSCA's time (4.4%) being used for activities involving community agencies or resources. Further verification of activities performed by HSCA's was found in the analysis

of the Pupil Questionnaire and the Professional Staff Questionnaire. Analysis of the Professional Staff Questionnaire also indicated that 87.4% of the respondents viewed the HSCA role of home-school-community liaison to be important, and 89.3% rated the HSCA as very effective in providing liaison services. The data indicated that Objective 3.0 was achieved.

Objective 4.0 was to provide at least two inservice sessions to program personnel such that at least 80% of the inservice participants will rate each session as valuable in providing information that will assist them in carrying out their program responsibilities. Four inservice meetings were held during the 1982-83 school year. Ratings given by 96.7% of the participants in these meetings indicated that the information presented would assist them in their program. Both criteria for Objective 4.0 were achieved.

The data collected for the 1982-83 Home-School-Community Agent project indicate that the project was successful in identifying disruptive pupils and helping them make some positive adjustment to those elements in their lives that interfere with their success in school. In addition, the project was considered valuable by pupils and professional staff members involved in the project. However, pupils did not show statistically significant ($p < .05$) improvement in their attitude as measured by the Total Score of the Demos D Scale.

The school system has just completed a comprehensive, two year study of the high school program. The findings of the study and recommendations for improvement of high school education will be reported to the superintendent in July of 1983. It is recommended that the goals of the Home-School-Community Agents project be reviewed in light of that report to determine if the program is consistent with the plans to improve high school education or if it would be more appropriate to direct the expenditures for the HSCA program to other efforts.

References

Demos, G.D., The Demos D (Dropout) Scale. Los Angeles, California: Western Psychological Services, 1980.

APPENDIX

		Posttest Dropout Probability Categories					
		5	25	50	70	90	Total
Pretest Dropout Probability Categories	5	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0
	25	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0
	50	0 0.0	1 0.4	183 78.9	21 9.1	7 3.0	212 91.4
	70	0 0.0	0 0.0	4 1.7	8 3.4	0 0.0	12 5.2
	90	0 0.0	0 0.0	4 1.7	2 0.9	2 0.0	8 3.4
	Total	0 0.0	1 0.4	191 82.3	31 13.4	9 3.9	232 100.0

Note. Pupils on the diagonal showed no change in category. Pupils to the left of the diagonal moved to a more positive category. Pupils to the right of the diagonal moved to a more negative category.

Figure 1. Crosstabulation of the Number and Percent of Pupils in Pretest-Posttest Dropout Probability Categories (Chance of Dropping Out Per 100 Pupils) Based on Demos D Total Score for All Pupils

		Posttest Dropout Probability Categories					
		5	25	50	70	90	Total
Pretest Dropout Probability Categories	5	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0
	25	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0
	50	0 0.0	0 0.0	23 67.6	6 17.6	3 8.8	32 94.1
	70	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	2 5.9	0 0.0	2 5.9
	90	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0
	Total	0 0.0	0 0.0	23 67.6	8 23.5	3 8.0	34 100.0

Note. Pupils on the diagonal showed no change in category. Pupils to the left of the diagonal moved to a more positive category. Pupils to the right of the diagonal moved to a more negative category.

Figure 2. Crosstabulation of the Number and Percent of Pupils in Pretest-Posttest Dropout Probability Categories (Chance of Dropping Out Per 100 Pupils) Based on DDS Total Score for Grade Six

Posttest Dropout Probability Categories

		5	25	50	70	90	Total
Pretest Dropout Probability Categories	5	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0
	25	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0
	50	0 0.0	1 2.9	26 78.8	5 15.2	1 2.9	33 94.3
	70	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	1 2.9	0 0.0	1 2.9
	90	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	1 2.9	1 2.9
	Total	0 0.0	1 2.9	26 74.3	6 17.1	2 5.7	35 100.0

Note. Pupils on the diagonal showed no change in category. Pupils to the left of the diagonal moved to a more positive category. Pupils to the right of the diagonal moved to a more negative category.

Figure 3. Crosstabulation of the Number and Percent of Pupils in Pretest-Posttest Dropout Probability Categories (Chance of Dropping Out Per 100 Pupils) Based on DDS Total Score for Grade Seven

		Posttest Dropout Probability Categories					
		5	25	50	70	90	Total
Pretest Dropout Probability Categories	5	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0
	25	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0
	50	0 0.0	0 0.0	61 87.1	1 1.4	1 1.4	63 90.0
	70	0 0.0	0 0.0	2 2.9	0 0.0	0 0.0	2 2.9
	90	0 0.0	0 0.0	4 5.7	0 0.0	1 1.4	5 7.1
	Total	0 0.0	0 0.0	67 95.7	1 1.4	2 2.9	70 100.0

Note. Pupils on the diagonal showed no change in category. Pupils to the left of the diagonal moved to a more positive category. Pupils to the right of the diagonal moved to a more negative category.

Figure 4. Crosstabulation of the Number and Percent of Pupils in Pretest-Posttest Dropout Probability Categories (Chance of Dropping Out Per 100 Pupils) Based on DDS Total Score for Grade Eight

Posttest Dropout Probability Categories

		5	25	50	70	90	Total
Pretest Dropout Probability Categories	5	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0
	25	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0
	50	0 0.0	0 0.0	21 63.6	8 24.2	2 6.1	31 93.9
	70	0 0.0	0 0.0	1 3.0	1 3.0	0 0.0	2 6.1
	90	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0
	Total	0 0.0	0 0.0	22 66.7	9 27.3	2 6.1	33 100.0

Note. Pupils on the diagonal showed no change in category. Pupils to the left of the diagonal moved to a more positive category. Pupils to the right of the diagonal moved to a more negative category.

Figure 5. Crosstabulation of the Number and Percent of Pupils in Pretest-Posttest Dropout Probability Categories (Chance of Dropping Out Per 100 Pupils) Based on DDS Total Score for Grade Nine

Posttest Dropout Probability Categories

		5	25	50	70	90	Total
Pretest Dropout Probability Categories	5	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0
	25	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0
	50	0 0.0	0 0.0	21 84.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	21 84.0
	70	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	3 12.0	0 0.0	3 12.0
	90	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	1 4.0	0 0.0	0 0.0
	Total	0 0.0	0 0.0	21 84.0	4 16.0	0 0.0	25 100.0

Note. Pupils on the diagonal showed no change in category. Pupils to the left of the diagonal moved to a more positive category. Pupils to the right of the diagonal moved to a more negative category.

Figure 6. Crosstabulation of the Number and Percent of Pupils in Pretest-Posttest Dropout Probability Categories (Chance of Dropping Out Per 100 Pupils) Based on DDS Total Score for Grade Ten

		Posttest Dropout Probability Categories					
		5	25	50	70	90	Total
Pretest Dropout Probability Categories	5	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0
	25	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0
	50	0 0.0	0 0.0	13 81.3	0 0.0	0 0.0	13 81.3
	70	0 0.0	0 0.0	1 6.3	1 6.3	0 0.0	2 12.5
	90	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	1 6.3	0 0.0	1 6.3
	Total	0 0.0	0 0.0	14 87.5	2 12.5	0 0.0	16 100.0

Note. Pupils on the diagonal showed no change in category. Pupils to the left of the diagonal moved to a more positive category. Pupils to the right of the diagonal moved to a more negative category.

Figure 7. Crosstabulation of the Number and Percent of Pupils in Pretest-Posttest Dropout Probability Categories (Chance of Dropping Out Per 100 Pupils) Based on DDS Total Score for Grade Eleven

Posttest Dropout Probability Categories

		5	25	50	70	90	Total
Pretest Dropout Probability Categories	5	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0
	25	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0
	50	0 0.0	0 0.0	18 94.7	1 5.3	0 0.0	19 100.0
	70	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0
	90	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0
	Total	0 0.0	0 0.0	18 94.7	1 5.3	0 0.0	19 100.0

Note. Pupils on the diagonal showed no change in category. Pupils to the left of the diagonal moved to a more positive category. Pupils to the right of the diagonal moved to a more negative category.

Figure 8. Crosstabulation of the Number and Percent of Pupils in Pretest-Posttest Dropout Probability Categories (Chance of Dropping Out Per 100 Pupils) Based on DDS Total Score for Grade Twelve

Numbers in parenthesis are
for purposes of Data Processing

DPPF
HSCA
PUPIL ENTRY INFORMATION SHEET

PROGRAM	8 3 0 5 2	(1-5)
COST CENTER		(6-8)
SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBER		(9-17)

HSCA ______________________

School ______________________

Referral Reason(s) (39-49)

01. Hostile to Authority
02. Pupil-Teacher Conflict
03. Law-Court Conflict
04. Class Cutting
05. Family Problem
06. Attendance Problem
07. Truancy
08. Peer Conflict
09. Poor Grades
10. Health Problem
11. Other

Student Name First	M.I.	Last	Student Number (18-23)	Grade (24-25)	Referral Reason(s) 01	02	03	04	05	06	07	08	09	10	11	Name and Position of Referrer: Position	Name

HOME SCHOOL COMMUNITY AGENTS PROJECT
LOG SHEET

Your Date to be Logged is _____

Please Return to Evaluation Services Within Two Days

(1 - 5) Program Code | 8 | 3 | 0 | 5 | 3 |

(6 - 8) Cost Center # | | | |

(9 - 17) Social Security # | | | | | | | | | |

School Name

LABEL

	Activity	Hrs.	Min.	
In School Conferences	With Student			(18-20)
	With School Personnel			(21-23)
	With Parent			(24-26)
	With Community Agency			(27-29)
	With Other Than Above			(30-32)
Voluntary School Duties				(33-35)
Home Visit				(36-38)
Transport Student (other than home)				(39-41)
Telephone Contact				(42-44)
Records, Reports, Paperwork, General Office Work				(45-47)
Supervising Special Projects				(48-50)
Check on Absent Students or Problem Students				(51-53)
Assigned School Duties				(54-56)
Utilizing Community Agencies or Resources				(57-59)
Court Appearance				(60-62)
Dealing with Disturbances				(63-65)
Attend Workshop or Staff Meeting				(66-68)
Other (briefly describe on reverse side)				(69-71)

ES 01/81

GENERAL INSERVICE EVALUATION FORM

Inservice Topic: _____

Presenter(s): _____

_____

Date: _____ (e.g., 7/15/79)

Session: ____a.m. or ____p.m.

Fund:
(circle only one)
(1) ESEA (2) DPPF (3) General
(4) Other (Specify)_____

Program:
(circle only one)
(1) ADK (2) Aides (3) BMIP (4) CLEAR-Elem (K-5)
(5) CLEAR-Middle (6) Elem. Couns. (7) HSCA
(8) OND (9) PREK (10) SDR (11) Regular Teacher
(12) Other (Specify)_____

Circle the number that indicates the extent to which you agree with statements 1-4.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree
1. I think this was a very worthwhile meeting.	1	2	3	4	5
2. The information presented in this meeting will assist me in my program.	1	2	3	4	5
3. There was time to ask questions pertaining to the presentation.	1	2	3	4	5
4. Questions were answered adequately.	1	2	3	4	5

5. What was the most valuable part of this meeting?_____

_____

6. What was the least valuable part of this meeting? _____

_____

7. What additional information or topics would you like to see covered in future meetings? _____

_____

_____

DES 8/81

HOME-SCHOOL-COMMUNITY AGENT PROJECT

PROFESSIONAL STAFF SURVEY

Please circle the number after each statement that shows how much you agree with each statement.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. The Home-School-Community Agents role as a liaison between home, school, community is important.	1	2	3	4	5
2. The Home-School-Community Agent has been effective in providing liaison between home, school, and community.	1	2	3	4	5
3. The services of the Home-School-Community Agent to the total instructional effort at your building are valuable.	1	2	3	4	5
4. The student(s) you referred to the Home-School-Community Agent showed some improvement.	1	2	3	4	5
5. The Home-School-Community Agent helps the disruptive student(s) make positive adjustment to school.	1	2	3	4	5
6. The Home-School-Community Agent helps the disruptive student(s) make positive adjustment to home.	1	2	3	4	5
7. The Home-School-Community Agent helps the disruptive student(s) make positive adjustment to the community.	1	2	3	4	5

In order to solve the problem(s) of student(s) you referred, the Home-School-Community Agent:

	Frequently	Sometimes	Undecided	Infrequently	Never
8. Made home visits:	1	2	3	4	5
9. Held conference(s) with you concerning the student(s):	1	2	3	4	5
10. Had conferences with student(s) you referred:	1	2	3	4	5
11. Arranged student conferences at school which included parents and/or professional staff.	1	2	3	4	5
12. Enlisted help from community agencies (such as CMACAO, CETA, Health Centers, Etc.)	1	2	3	4	5
13. Helped student(s) find employment:	1	2	3	4	5
14. Appeared in court in regard to the student(s).	1	2	3	4	5

ES/81

PUPIL QUESTIONNAIRE
HOME-SCHOOL-COMMUNITY AGENT PROGRAM

You have met with _____, the Home School Community Agent in your school, during this school year. The following questions give you a chance to express your feelings about how the Home-School-Community Agent has helped you. This is not a test. You do not have to give your name. When you are finished, fold your completed questionnaire and give it to a secretary in the school office, who will put it in the school mail.

Thanks for your help.

Please circle your response to each statement.

1. I first met with the Home-School-Community Agent this year because

A. the principal or vice-principal arranged it.	Yes	No	Don't Know
B. my teacher(s) arranged it.	Yes	No	Don't Know
C. my friend(s) arranged it.	Yes	No	Don't Know
D. my parent(s) arranged it.	Yes	No	Don't Know
E. I had a problem and went to see the HSCA on my own.	Yes	No	Don't Know

2. In order to help me, the Home-School-Community Agent

A. visited my home.	Yes	No	Don't Know
B. arranged a meeting(s) with my teacher(s).	Yes	No	Don't Know
C. took time to discuss my problems with me.	Yes	No	Don't Know
D. visited a community agency on my behalf, such as CHACAO, Health Center, or counseling agency.	Yes	No	Don't Know

3. Since I talked to the Home-School-Community Agent, I am getting along better with

A. my teachers	Yes	No	Don't Know
B. my family	Yes	No	Don't Know
C. my friends	Yes	No	Don't Know

4. The Home-School-Community Agent was helpful to me.	Yes	No	Don't Know
5. I feel my classroom attendance has improved since meeting with the Home-School-Community Agent.	Yes	No	Don't Know
6. I am keeping up with my assignments better since working with the Home-School-Community Agent.	Yes	No	Don't Know
7. When a student has trouble in school or with a teacher, it is a good idea to talk it over with the Home-School-Community Agent.	Yes	No	Don't Know
8. Students with problems can get help from the Home-School-Community Agent.	Yes	No	Don't Know

ES 1/83

TEACHER NUMBER	PROGRAM CODE

STUDENT	SCHOOL	GRADE	SEX
			MALE ○ FEMALE ○

TOTAL DAYS OF PROGRAM ENROLLMENT	TOTAL DAYS OF PROGRAM ATTENDANCE	HOURS OF INSTRUCTION PER WEEK
1 2 3	4 5 6	

NCS Trans-Optic 08-8153-32

42

COLUMBUS PUBLIC SCHOOLS - Columbus, Ohio PUPIL CENSUS FORM

LAST NAME | FIRST NAME | M. I. | SEX | TEACHER NUMBER

SCHOOL | H. R. | GRADE

USE A NUMBER 2 PENCIL. ERASE COMPLETELY WHEN MAKING CORRECTIONS.

1. HAS THIS PUPIL HAD ANY INVOLVEMENT WITH THE COURT?
   YES NO

2. HOW MANY MONTHS HAS THIS PUPIL BEEN SERVED BY THE PROGRAM?
   0-5 6-10 11-15 16-20 21-25 MORE

3. NUMBER OF CONTACTS WITH THIS PUPIL?
   0-3 4-6 7-10 11 OR MORE

4. NUMBER OF IN-SCHOOL CONFERENCES HELD REGARDING THIS PUPIL?
   0-3 4-6 7-10 11 OR MORE

5. NUMBER OF HOME VISITS MADE REGARDING THIS PUPIL?
   0-3 4-6 7-10 11 OR MORE

6. DID YOU REFER THIS PUPIL TO A COMMUNITY AGENCY?
   YES NO

7. FINAL OUTCOME - CONCERNING THE ORIGINAL REFERRAL REASON(S)?
   MARKED IMPROVEMENT IMPROVEMENT NO IMPROVEMENT

43